

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

B.E. TECHNOLOGY, L.L.C.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	Civil Action No. 12-cv-02767 – JPM-tmp
)	
v.)	
)	
AMAZON DIGITAL SERVICES, INC.)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

B.E. TECHNOLOGY, L.L.C.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	Civil Action No. 12-cv-02769 – JPM-tmp
)	
v.)	
)	
FACEBOOK, INC.)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

B.E. TECHNOLOGY, L.L.C.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	Civil Action No. 12-cv-02772 – JPM-tmp
)	
v.)	
)	
LINKEDIN CORP.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

B.E. TECHNOLOGY, L.L.C.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	Civil Action No. 12-cv-02781 – JPM-tmp
)	
v.)	
)	
GROUPON, INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

B.E. TECHNOLOGY, L.L.C.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	Civil Action No. 12-cv-02782 – JPM-tmp
)	
v.)	
)	
PANDORA MEDIA, INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

B.E. TECHNOLOGY, L.L.C.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	Civil Action No. 12-cv-02783 – JPM-tmp
)	
v.)	
)	
TWITTER, INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

B.E. TECHNOLOGY, L.L.C.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	Civil Action No. 12-cv-02823 – JPM-tmp
)	
v.)	
)	
BARNES & NOBLE, INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

B.E. TECHNOLOGY, L.L.C.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	Civil Action No. 12-cv-02824 – JPM-tmp
)	
v.)	
)	
SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS)	
AMERICA, LLC,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	
)	

B.E. TECHNOLOGY, L.L.C.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	Civil Action No. 12-cv-02825 – JPM-tmp
v.)	
)	
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA,)	
INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
<hr/>		
B.E. TECHNOLOGY, L.L.C.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	Civil Action No. 12-cv-02826 – JPM-tmp
v.)	
)	
SONY COMPUTER ENTERTAINMENT)	
AMERICA LLC,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
<hr/>		
B.E. TECHNOLOGY, L.L.C.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	Civil Action No. 12-cv-02827 – JPM-tmp
v.)	
)	
SONY MOBILE)	
COMMUNICATIONS (USA) INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
<hr/>		
B.E. TECHNOLOGY, L.L.C.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	Civil Action No. 12-cv-02828 – JPM-tmp
v.)	
)	
SONY ELECTRONICS INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
<hr/>		

B.E. TECHNOLOGY, L.L.C.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	Civil Action No. 12-cv-02829 – JPM-tmp
)	
v.)	
)	
MICROSOFT CORP.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

B.E. TECHNOLOGY, L.L.C.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	Civil Action No. 12-cv-02830 – JPM-tmp
)	
v.)	
)	
GOOGLE INC.)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

B.E. TECHNOLOGY, L.L.C.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	Civil Action No. 12-cv-02831 – JPM-tmp
)	
v.)	
)	
APPLE INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

B.E. TECHNOLOGY, L.L.C.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	Civil Action No. 12-cv-02833 – JPM-tmp
)	
v.)	
)	
PEOPLE MEDIA, INC.)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

B.E. TECHNOLOGY, L.L.C.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	Civil Action No. 12-cv-02834 – JPM-tmp
)	
v.)	
)	
MATCH.COM, LLC,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

B.E. TECHNOLOGY, L.L.C.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	Civil Action No. 12-cv-02866 – JPM-tmp
)	
v.)	
)	
MOTOROLA MOBILITY)	
HOLDINGS LLC,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

SUPPLEMENTAL JOINT INTERIM STATUS
NOTICE REGARDING *INTER PARTES* REVIEWS

On April 15, 2015, the parties to this action (and the seventeen related actions by plaintiff) filed a Joint Interim Status Notice to provide the Court with updated information on the *inter partes* reviews initiated during 2014, consistent with the *Order Granting Motions to Stay* entered on December 6, 2013.¹ In that April notice, the parties reported that the Patent Trial and

¹ / The *Order Granting Motions to Stay* bears differing ECF Numbers among the eighteen related cases. It is ECF No. 71 in the first listed case, *B.E. Technology, LLC v. Amazon Digital Services, Inc.*, No. 2:12-cv-02767-JPM-tmp. The *inter partes* review proceedings are identified by IPR Number, Patent, Claims, and Filer in notices previously filed with the Court, one counterpart of which is ECF No. 75 in the *Amazon* case. A counterpart of the April 15, 2015 joint notice is ECF No. 78 in the *Amazon* case.

Appeal Board (“PTAB”) of the United States Patent and Trademark Office had entered written decisions in those proceedings, finding that every claim of U.S. Patent Numbers 6,771,290 and 6,628,314 asserted against any of the eighteen defendants in these actions is unpatentable. The parties committed to keep the Court informed of material developments in the PTAB proceedings, and suggested in substance that the existing stay Orders remain in effect pending plaintiff’s determination of whether to appeal one or more of the PTAB decisions.

Since that joint notice, plaintiff has in fact commenced appeals of the PTAB decisions in all eleven of the *inter parties* review proceedings. In view of this development, and to continue achievement of the purposes of the stay Orders, the parties request that the stays in this and the corresponding actions remain in effect until the conclusion of such appeals. The parties continue their commitment to apprise the Court promptly of developments that logically would warrant consideration of dissolving or modifying the stays or a resumed case schedule.

Respectfully submitted:

/s/Robert E. Freitas (PER CONSENT MVB)

Robert E. Freitas (CA Bar No. 80948)

FREITAS ANGELL & WEINBERG LLP

350 Marine Parkway, Suite 200

Redwood Shores, CA 94065

Telephone: (650) 593-6300

Facsimile: (650) 593-6301

rfreitas@fawlaw.com

Richard M. Carter (TN B.P.R. #7285)

MARTIN, TATE, MORROW & MARSTON, P.C.

6410 Poplar Avenue, Suite 1000

Memphis, TN 38119-4839

Telephone: (901) 522-9000

Facsimile: (901) 527-3746

rcarter@martintate.com

Counsel for Plaintiff B.E. Technology, L.L.C.

Respectfully submitted:

/s/ Mark Vorder-Bruegge, Jr.
Mark Vorder-Bruegge, Jr. (No. 6389)
Wyatt, Tarrant & Combs, LLP
1715 Aaron Brenner Dr., Suite 800
Memphis, TN 38120
Phone: 901-537-1000
Fax: 901-537-1010
mvorderbruegge@wyattfirm.com

Counsel for Defendant

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The foregoing notice having been filed via the Court's CM/ECF system, a copy is being automatically served upon all counsel of record for both parties in each of the above-captioned actions.

/s/ Mark Vorder-Bruegge, Jr.
Mark Vorder-Bruegge, Jr.